

instead of *Bulinus*. However, he could have followed Broderip (1828, *Zoological Journal*, part 4, p. 222) in substituting *Bulinus* for *Bulinus* Scopoli, 1777. In the latter case *Bulinus* sensu Sowerby (1853), i.e. *Bulinus* Broderip, 1828, is a different genus from *Bulinus* sensu Mandahl-Barth (1954), i.e. *Bulinus* O.F. Müller, 1781; Article 57.8.1 of the Code applies and the homonymy of the species names is to be disregarded.

As this contention is difficult or impossible to prove, it might be best for the Commission to rule that Sowerby (1853) made a clerical error, writing *Bulinus* for *Bulinus*, and that there exists no primary homonymy between Sowerby and Mandahl-Barth's species names.

(2) D.S. Brown, F. Naggs and V.R. Southgate

*Department of Zoology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,
London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

In his comment (above), Prof Holthuis has suggested that Sowerby (1853) misspelled *Bulinus* and wrote '*Bulinus*' and that, under Article 57.8.1 of the Code, the homonymy between *Bulinus wrightii* Sowerby and *Bulinus wrighti* Mandahl-Barth is to be disregarded.

This course would be acceptable if the two taxa named *wrightii* could be shown to have been placed in combination 'with homonymous generic names having the same spelling but established for different nominal genera'. This depends on whether the ACHATINIDAE and the PLANORBIDAE are considered to be sufficiently different; though distinct they are both gastropod molluscs and clearly not so different as the Insecta and Aves in the example given in the Code.

In submitting our application it seemed to us that, even if the homonymy could be disregarded, a worker was still likely to propose an unfortunate replacement name for *Bulinus wrighti* Mandahl-Barth, 1965 if the issue was not settled, and the name conserved, by Commission action.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Polydora websteri* Hartman in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (Annelida, Polychaeta) by a ruling that it is not to be treated as a replacement name for *P. caeca* Webster, 1879, and designation of a lectotype for *P. websteri*

(Case 3080; see BZN 55: 212–216)

(1) Geoffrey B. Read

*National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, 310 Evans Bay Parade,
Kilbirnie, Wellington, New Zealand*

Hartman (1943) proposed the replacement name *Polydora websteri* for the invalid *P. caeca* of Webster (1879) (para. 4 of the application). I support the proposal to conserve *P. websteri* in accordance with Hartman's concept, and to designate a lectotype.

Since the application by Radashevsky & Williams was published (BZN 55: 212–216, December 1998), Radashevsky (1999) has redescribed Hartman's original (1943) specimens, including the proposed lectotype. It is clear from Hartman's

description and the re-examination of her specimens that Hartman's replacement name for *Polydora caeca* Webster was based on a misidentification. I fully support the conclusion that *Polydora websteri* Hartman is a different species from *P. caeca* Webster.

The application was prompted by the recent discovery of *Polydora* specimens supposedly matching Webster's (1879) description of *P. caeca* and now described as *P. neocaeca* by Williams & Radashevsky (1999) (paras. 6 and 10 of the application). The new specimens were collected from Rhode Island.

In their application, Radashevsky & Williams have requested the Commission to conserve the name *P. websteri* for Hartman's species because the name has been widely used in aquaculture and generally in studies of shell borers. I support this proposal for a further reason. Past aquaculture and taxonomic records of *Polydora websteri* in the U.S.A. and elsewhere undoubtedly refer to more than one species, including the newly-recognised *P. neocaeca* with which *P. websteri* reportedly coexists in mollusc shells (see Williams & Radashevsky, 1999). Possibly some reports ostensibly solely of *P. websteri* also included *P. neocaeca*. It would assist further elucidation of the taxonomy and biology of this group of morphologically-similar species if *P. websteri* is stabilised by a lectotype.

The type material of *Polydora caeca* Webster, collected from Northampton Co., Virginia, cannot be found (para. 7 of the application). Williams & Radashevsky (1999) consider that their new species, *P. neocaeca*, collected from Rhode Island, is not only much closer to *P. caeca* than the taxon collected from Connecticut and described by Hartman as *P. websteri*, but 'was found to match Webster's description ...'. In my view this is not correct as there are differences in palp and body pigmentation, in branchial distribution, presence of eyes, in morphology of the first segment, the segment five setae, and the pygidium, that are discernible from Webster's text and setal drawings and not addressed in the application or in the two subsequent descriptive papers by Radashevsky (1999) and Williams & Radashevsky (1999). Such differences are not minor, and I suggest that the interesting coincidence of palp banding does not allow us to ignore them.

The widely-distributed *Polydora brevipalpa* Zachs, 1933, also with palp-banding, shows similarities to Webster's description. In addition there are several *Polydora*-group species known to be so similar that they cannot be reliably separated morphologically (see, for example, Rice 1991; Manchenko & Radashevsky, 1998). Such examples lead to the conclusion that *P. caeca* Webster and *P. neocaeca* are different taxonomic species when there are unresolved differences in their descriptions. While there are no other similar species with banding previously recorded from near the *P. caeca* Virginia type locality it is possible that one exists which has been as yet overlooked. As other *Polydora*-group species have frequently been reported as invasive aliens, it is possible *P. neocaeca* is an introduction from elsewhere, arriving on the U.S.A. eastern coast subsequent to Webster (1879).

Additional references

- Manchenko, G.P. & Radashevsky, V.I. 1998. Genetic evidence for two sibling species within *Polydora* cf. *ciliata* (Polychaeta: Spionidae) from the Sea of Japan. *Marine Biology* (Berlin), **131**: 489-495.
- Radashevsky, V.I. 1999. Description of the proposed lectotype for *Polydora websteri* Hartman in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (Polychaeta: Spionidae). *Ophelia*, **51**(2): 107-113.

- Rice, S.A. 1991. Reproductive isolation in the *Polydora ligni* complex and the *Streblospio benedicti* complex (Polychaeta: Spionidae). *Bulletin of Marine Science*, **48**: 432–447.
- Williams, J.D. & Radashevsky, V.I. 1999. Morphology, ecology, and reproduction of a new *Polydora* species from the east coast of North America (Polychaeta: Spionidae). *Ophelia*, **51**(2): 115–127.

(2) Mary E. Petersen

Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15,
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

I strongly urge that the proposed conservation of the specific name of the polychaetous annelid *Polydora websteri* Hartman in Loosanoff & Engle, 1943 (SPIONIDAE) and designation of a lectotype for this species be supported.

The application by Radashevsky & Williams (BZN **55**: 212–216) is clearly presented and well argued. It requests conservation of the specific name *websteri* for the species seen and described by Hartman (1943), and not for the distinct species (*P. caeca* Webster, 1879) for which Hartman intended it to be a new replacement name (nomen novum) because of homonymy with the older *Leucodorum coecum* Örsted, 1843 (currently *Dipolydora coeca*).

As pointed out by Radashevsky & Williams, the species described by Hartman is well known and widely distributed, whereas the species seen and described by Webster (1879) has until recently not been recognized. The authors mention (paras. 6 and 10) only two known finds of the species since it was described: material of S.H. Hopkins from off Virginia (the type locality of *P. caeca*), and more recently live material from Rhode Island.

Hartman's original material of *Polydora websteri* is extant, and a proposed lectotype, in agreement with Hartman's description and also with that of others who have used the name, has been selected and redescribed by Radashevsky (1999).

Williams & Radashevsky (1999) have also provided a careful and detailed description of a new nominal species, *P. neocaeca* Williams & Radashevsky, 1999 based on material from Rhode Island, and very clearly indicated that their material fits the description of *P. caeca* from Virginia by Webster. This acknowledges that two taxonomic species are involved and promotes stability in maintaining the present usage and type locality of *P. websteri*.

The proposals made by Radashevsky and Williams in their application are well considered and I suggest that supporting their application will promote the greatest nomenclatural stability.

Comment on the proposed designation of *Cuma rathkii* Krøyer, 1841 as the type species of *Diastylis* Say, 1818 (Crustacea, Cumacea)
(Case 3078; see BZN **56**: 174–176)

L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands

Dr Gerken's application is most welcome and actually long overdue. The unfortunate fact that *Diastylis* has a type species of doubtful identity has been known